

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-27 were previously pending in the application. Claims 1, 5-6, 10-12, 15-16, 18, 22, 24, and 26-27 are amended, and new claims 28-31 are added herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1-31 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

In paragraph 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9, 12-18, 20-22, and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Amin. In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 8, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin. In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 10-11 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin in view of Zicker. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all now-pending claims are allowable over Amin and Zicker.

### Claims 1-30:

Support for the amendment of independent claim 1 can be found, e.g., in Applicant's Fig. 3 and the corresponding description. Independent claims 12 and 18 are similarly amended.

Amended claim 1 specifies, inter alia, that each supplemental transceiver unit (STU) has a primary function and is further adapted to support a direct wireless communication link between the STU and at least one mobile station.

In the rejection of original claim 1, the Examiner pointed to Amin's Fig. 4 and indicated that the system units shown in that figure and designated by reference numbers **400**, **72**, **110**, **120**, and **130** would be examples of an STU recited in claim 1. Regarding digital splitter **400**, television set **110**, personal computer **120**, and telephone **130**, the Applicant points out that none of these system units has a direct wireless communication link with telephone handset (mobile station) **75**. Regarding fixed wireless base station (FWBS) **72**, the Applicant points out that, although it is true that the FWBS supports a direct wireless communication link with telephone handset **75**, it is also true that the FWBS does not have a primary function in addition to the function of supporting that direct communication link. As such, none of Amin's system units **400**, **72**, **110**, **120**, and **130** is adapted to perform both a respective primary function and a further function of supporting a direct wireless communication link between the STU and at least one mobile station, as explicitly recited in amended claim 1. It is therefore submitted that none of these system units can serve as an example of an STU recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that Amin does not teach or even suggest a system unit that would be adapted to perform both of the specified functions.

Zicker discloses a multi-mode communication network having cellular base stations **20** and cordless base stations **22**. Again, as in the case of Amin's FWBS **72**, Zicker's base stations **20** and **22** do not have a primary function in addition to the function of supporting their respective direct wireless communication links with mobile handset **18** (see Zicker's Fig. 2 and the corresponding text). It is therefore submitted that none of base stations **20** and **22** can serve as an example of an STU recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that Zicker does not teach or even suggest a system unit that would be adapted to perform both of the specified functions.

Advantageously over the communication systems of Amin and Zicker, embodiments of the system recited in claim 1 provide a wireless communication system with a reduced number of blind spots, where the reduction is achieved at a lower cost than that in comparably performing

prior-art systems. The lower cost is realized due to the synergy of multi-functional use of the equipment, which can support a wireless communication link with a mobile station in addition to the designated primary function.

For all these reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Amin and Zicker. For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 12 and 18 are also allowable over Amin and Zicker. Since claims 2-11, 13-17, and 19-30 depend variously from claims 1, 12, and 18, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Amin and Zicker. The Applicant submits therefore that the rejections of claims under §§ 102 and 103 over Amin and Zicker have been overcome.

Claims 6, 15, and 27-30:

Support for the amendments of claims 6, 15, and 27 can be found, e.g., on page 5, line 1, and in Fig. 3. Support for new claims 28-30 can be found, e.g., in original claims 6, 15, and 27, respectively.

Each of claims 6, 15, and 27 now specifies, inter alia, that each STU is an appliance unit, which has a TV receiver, wherein the primary function is to receive TV programs for further display on a display screen.

Among system units **400**, **72**, **110**, **120**, and **130** disclosed by Amin and base stations **20** and **22** disclosed by Zicker, only Amin's television set **110** is an appliance unit having a TV receiver. However, as already indicated above, television set **110** is not an example of an STU because it does not have a direct wireless communication link with telephone handset (mobile station) **75**. These facts provide additional reasons for the allowability of claims 6, 15, and 27 and their dependent claims 28-30 over Amin and Zicker.

Claim 31:

New claim 31 is equivalent to original claim 9 rewritten in independent form. Claim 31 specifies, inter alia, that the mobile services switching center (MSC) and the supplemental switching center (SSC) have a service link to coordinate transmissions for a selected mobile station.

In the rejection of original claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, on page 4 of the office action, the Examiner pointed to paragraphs [0026-0028] and [0030-0031] in Amin and stated that "Amin et al. disclose MSC and the SSC have a service link to coordinate transmissions for a selected mobile station." Also, on pages 2 and 3, the Examiner indicated that he considered wireless switch **180** and cable network **460** to be examples of the MSC and SSC, respectively.

After careful inspection of the pointed to paragraphs [0026-0028] and [0030-0031] in Amin, the Applicant submits that those paragraphs do not teach or even suggest a service link between wireless switch **180** and cable network **460** to coordinate transmissions for telephone handset (mobile station) **75**, the Examiner's statement to the contrary notwithstanding. Moreover, the Applicant submits that the entire disclosure of Amin does not teach or even suggest this feature. The Applicant invites the Examiner to prove otherwise by providing a citation from Amin that would fairly imply the existence of the recited service link in Amin's communication system.

Moreover, it is apparent from the pointed-to paragraph [0027] that digital splitter **400** acts as a controller, which decides whether communications to and from telephone handset (mobile station) **75** are directed via cable network **460** or via wireless switch **180**. After digital splitter **400** has made its routing decision, cable network **460** and wireless switch **180** simply passively

accept it. The Applicant submits that Amin does not teach or suggest that cable network **460** and wireless switch **180** are somehow capable of coordinating, via some service link, their handling of the transmissions to and from telephone handset **75**.

For all these reasons, the Applicant submits that the Examiner mischaracterized the teachings of Amin and used them improperly to reject original claim 9. It is therefore submitted that the rejection of original claim 9 over Amin is improper and should be withdrawn and that claim 31 is allowable over Amin.

Miscellaneous Claim Amendments:

Each of claims 5, 10, 11, 16, and 26 is amended to make the claim language consistent with the language of the respective (amended) base claim.

Support for the amendment of claim 22 can be found, e.g., in original claim 9.

Claim 24 is amended to correct an antecedent-basis problem.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 06/14/06  
Customer No. 46850  
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.  
1500 JFK Boulevard, Suite 405  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Yuri Gruzdkov  
Registration No. 50,762  
Agent for Applicant  
(215) 557-8544 (phone)  
(215) 557-8477 (fax)